

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending.

The Examiner is requiring election of a species based on claim 15 being generic and the following species:

Species	Claims	Description
1	1-4	Receiving media data across a firewall utilizing a single media-relay server.
2	5-7, 14, 16	Receiving media data across a firewall utilizing two media-relay servers, wherein the first media-relay server modifies the RTP header to include the appended synchronization source identifier concatenated with the RTP header prior to being forwarded to the second media-relay server.
3	8-10	Receiving media data across a firewall utilizing two media-relay servers, wherein the sender modifies the RTP header to include the appended synchronization source identifier concatenated with the RTP header prior to being forwarded to the first media-relay server.
4	11-13	Receiving media data across a firewall utilizing three media-relay servers, wherein the first media-relay server is in a Demilitarized Zone of a network and the third media-relay server is in the internal network, and wherein the media packet is sent from the first media-relay server to the third media-relay server before being sent to the second media-relay server in a different network.

Applicant elects the claims 1-4 of species 1 with traverse. The claims do not have the mutually exclusive characteristics as the Examiner suggests.

The Examiner believes that claims 1-4 of species 1 are directed to "receiving media data across a firewall utilizing a single media-relay server." (Office Action, April 23, 2007, p.2, emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is nothing in these claims that limits them to "a single media-relay server." The use of another media-relay server is

not excluded from this claim. Indeed, the "Internet client's encrypted media packet" that is received could have been sent by another media-relay server (e.g., claims 5-10, 14, and 16 of species 2 and 3) or sent by multiple media-relay servers (e.g., claims 11-13 of species 4) on its way to the media-relay server recited in these claims. As such, claims 1-4 of species 1 are not mutually exclusive of the claims of the other species.

The Examiner believes that claim 5 of species 2 is directed to "the first media-relay server modif[ying] the RTP header." Applicant can find no language in claim 5 that indicates such modifying by the first media-relay server. As such, claim 5 is not mutually exclusive of the claims of the other species. In particular, it is not mutually exclusive of the language of claims 8-10 of species 3 relating to the client modifying the RTP header.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the requirement for election of species.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268874US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant